

exhibit his love of justice, and that he rejoiced in the result.¹ Even so, two instances of this kind cannot weigh in the balance against the Bloody Assizes, The special pleadings of Ailesbury and other apologists must be rejected : James was callous, vindictive, and cruel. It is impossible to show that he was ignorant of the severities in the west, or that he disapproved of the conduct of Jeffreys.

Immediately after the suppression of Monmouth's rebellion the King's intention to suspend the action of the laws against the Catholics became apparent. At the opening of the session, November 9, 1685, the King's speech announced that the standing army was to be permanently increased and that officers were to retain their commissions although they had not taken the Test. The Commons replied by a respectful protest, and the Lords were about to follow suit, when on November 20 James prorogued Parliament to prevent them. The two Houses never met again during the King's reign.

As Macaulay points out, the leaders of the Catholic aristocracy disapproved of the King's policy. They would have welcomed a discreet attempt to persuade Parliament to repeal the penal laws, but they feared the results of an effort to set aside the Test Act by the exercise of the prerogative or by force.² Ailesbury, after mentioning the King's speech and saying that its policy was *

contrary to the sense
of the old and landed Roman Catholics *, adds
:

The two Houses were in a deep melancholy.
That very
evening, according to custom, I went to visit
my worthy
friend and kinsman the Lord Bellasis, who
seldom ^stirred
out, being so infirm in his limbs. My Lord
Bellasis, who

¹ Macaulay's account (II, 697-700 [vl]) is as different as
possible to that of
Ailesbury.

² Klopp, *Der Fall des Hauses Stuart*, iii. 203, 306, 328.